

LEESBURG BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW STAFF REPORT

WORK SESSION: 3 DECEMBER 2012
AGENDA ITEM 6b

BAR Case No. THLP-2012-0114, TLHP-2012-0115, TLHP-2012-0116 and TLHP-2012-0117: Construction of porch roof and gazebo, installation of two signs and exterior painting for King's Tavern & Wine Bar

Reviewer: Kim K. Del Rance, LEED AP

Address: 19 S. King St.

Zoning: B-1, H-1 Overlay District

Applicant/Owner: Fabian Saeidi, King's Tavern & Wine Bar

Additional Information since the November 19, 2012 Regular Meeting:

The applicant submitted a paint sample of the "barn red" used on the rear of the building on the decking . Staff has visited the site and recommendations based on that visit are below.

<u>Description of Proposals</u>: This report is reviewing actions already taken on the building as well as signage added without prior approval:

TLHP-2012-0114: Porch roof on rear of building with new light fixtures and new gazebo added in back lot with plastic fence and shed attached to rear of building. Altering of window muntins on front storefront glass.



July 2008 photo (Bella Luna)



October 2012 photo (now King's Court)







Wall sign above back door under new porch roof

Projecting sign at back next to new porch roof

TLHP-2012-0115 and **TLHP-2012-0116**: 2 of the 3 existing signs: Window sign in front "King's Court", Wall sign above door in rear: King's Court Tavern" and projecting sign "King's Court Tavern" in rear of building

TLHP-2012-0117: Multiple paint colors and scheme

Site Development/Zoning Issues:

Based on the review of archived aerial photos the shed (in yellow above) has been there since 2002. But the gazebo does not appear on images until 2011 where the shadows prevent seeing that part of the property clearly. The 2012 image shows something that may be a deck with no roof, but that is unclear as well. According to Land Management Information Systems only one permit has been issued for this property, a fire assembly permit issued in March 2012. A permit for stairs to the existing deck was frozen in 2010 and a mechanical permit for upstairs was cancelled by the applicant in 2001.

• No zoning permits, sign permits or Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) applications have been submitted for this property since its ownership changed in 1983.

There are two COA applications from prior owners, one in 1978 for a sign for "The Art Roost" and the other in 1981 for a sign for "Loudoun United Way".

• The site visit revealed that the porch addition on the rear is roofed with a material normally used for siding metal buildings with a sawtooth corrugation.

OHD Design Guidelines:

For TLHP-2012-0114: Ch. VII GUIDELINES FOR ADDITIONS TO EXISTING BUILDINGS AND NEW CONSTRUCTION K. PORCHES AND PORTICOS P. 102

A standing seam metal roof that matches the existing roof is most appropriate for the porch roof.

Ch. VII Guidelines for additions to existing buildings and new construction D. Windows p. 54

- 1. Retain original or historic windows that contribute to the overall historic character of a building, including their functional and decorative features such as frames, sash, muntins, sills, moldings, surrounds, shutters, and blinds.
- 2. Repair original windows by patching, splicing, or consolidating materials.

The existing storefront windows had been symmetrical in their muntin placement both vertically and horizontally. Currently they do not match in either direction as the left storefront is divided vertically into three (3) segments and the right storefront is divided vertically into two (2) and then subdivided in two again with smaller muntins. Horizontally, the left storefront has no divisions, but the right has four (4) divisions. The current proportions of the storefront muntin divisions are not appropriate to be mismatched. The left storefront should be made to match the right storefront with additional muntins added back onto the glass.

FOR TLHP-2012-0115 AND TLHP-2012-0116 SIGNS:

The illegal neon sign has been addressed and the owner has been asked to remove it.

• The neon sign was still in place as of a site visit on November 28, 2012.

CH. VI GUIDELINES FOR THE PRESERVATION AND MODIFICATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURE: MATERIALS P.77 F. PAINT AND PAINT COLOR

The November 28, 2012 site visit revealed there are four different reds used on this building. The darkest is used on the door to the second floor; the next darkest red is on the side of the building around the window with the red on the rear deck structure being close to that color as well, only slightly lighter. The "Christmas" red on the front of the building is brighter than all of the other reds. To not appear disjointed, the same red should be used on the front as is used on the rear or side window if red is the desired color.

• The applicant submitted a paint sample of the "barn red" on the rear decking and would like to use the same color for the shed. The brighter red on the front will be repainted a darker red if it is not the same color as a mistaken can of paint may have been used, applicant will follow up.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION/DRAFT MOTION

(Based on the BAR's discussion at the meeting, any changes to the language of either part of the motion should be incorporated as necessary.)

Based on the findings that:

- The porch cover over the rear public entrance is appropriate with wood columns as designed, but the roof material is not appropriate and should match the existing standing seam metal roof on the primary structure
- The new wall sconce light fixtures at the rear entry door to the restaurant are utilitarian with a visible light source which are not appropriate for a business entry
- The freestanding gazebo is not subordinate to the primary structure, is not compatible with the architecture and is not sited in a garden or back yard as is appropriate for gazebos
- Plastic lattice is not a traditional fence material both as a material and as a pattern for fences
- The left storefront is no longer symmetrical with the right storefront glass
- The existing wall sign placement is above a door which is not appropriate unless the Board finds it can be designed to fit into the architectural space
- The existing projecting sign placement on the rear deck is not at the entry door as is appropriate

There are two alternatives for these applications:

Staff recommends denial of **TLHP-2012-0114**, **TLHP-2012-0115**, **TLHP-2012-0116** and **TLHP-2012-0117** subject to the plans, photographs and materials submitted as part of this application dated October 31, 2012.

-OR-

Staff recommends approval of **TLHP-2012-0114** with the following conditions:

- The porch roof will be reroofed with a standing seam metal roof to match the existing roof on the primary structure
- The gazebo will be removed and the plastic lattice will be replaced with a simple wood fence to be approved by staff under the normal administrative review process.
- The lighting fixtures will be replaced with suitable fixtures to be approved by staff under the normal administrative review process.

- The muntins will be restored to the left storefront to match the right storefront and regain its symmetry
- All applicable Town and County Zoning and Building Permits must be obtained prior to proceeding with work

Staff recommends removal of the window sign and approval of **TLHP-2012-0115** for the wall sign to be lowered to the side of the rear entry door or redesigned to fit into the space above the door.

 All applicable Town and County Zoning and Building Permits must be obtained prior to proceeding with work

Staff recommends approval of **TLHP-2012-0116** for the projecting sign to be moved to the front entry door.

 All applicable Town and County Zoning and Building Permits must be obtained prior to proceeding with work

Staff recommends of the approval of **TLHP-2012-0117** for red paint that matches the existing red paint on the rear of the building.

- The yellow shed will be repainted to match the red rear decking
- The red on the front will be made to match the barn red on the rear of the building
- All applicable Town and County Zoning and Building Permits must be obtained prior to proceeding with work

DRAFT MOTION(S)

I move that **TLHP-2012-0114**, **TLHP-2012-0115**, **TLHP-2012-0116** and **TLHP-2012-0117** be denied and resubmitted with appropriate proposals due to the majority of actions not being appropriate.

-OR-

I move that **TLHP-2012-0114**, **TLHP-2012-0115**, **TLHP-2012-0116** and **TLHP-2012-0117** be approved subject to the application submitted by Fabian Saeidi and the site visits of staff and photos submitted by Carmen Babonneau on October 31, 2012 and November 28, 2012 and subject to the findings and conditions of approval as stated in the December 3, 2012 Staff Report (or as amended by the BAR on December 3, 2012).